

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 19, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to speak with Applicants' representative on several occasions. Applicants' representative believes that the amended claims enclosed herewith reflect the outcome of the discussions between Applicants' representative and the Examiner. If the Examiner has any questions, she is urged to contact the Applicants' representative at 617-542-6000.

35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections

Claims 1 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 "as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." Office Action dated 10/19/06, p. 3.

Though Applicants believe that the recitation "workflow event" is fully supported by the specification and complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 26. Claim 1 now recites a system that includes a workflow module that is configured to automatically perform an event driven action corresponding to a trigger event in response to the trigger event occurring. Claim 26 now recites a system that includes a workflow module that is configured to automatically perform an event-driven action in response to a trigger event occurring. Support for the term "trigger" can be found at, for example, paragraphs 27 and 72 of the specification. Support for the term "event-driven action" can be found at, for example, paragraph 27 and 81 of the specification. For example, the term "event-driven action" includes approval, computing of a hash code, a user programmed action, a predetermined system action, and notifying a selected user when a file is ready for action.

Claims 2 and 5-25, which depend from independent claim 1, stand rejected for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 2 and 4-25 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 28-32, which depend from independent claim 26, stand rejected for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1. Though Applicants assert

that claim 26 is patentably distinct from independent claim 1, claim 26 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to independent claim 1.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative would help expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 542-6000.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-0311, Reference No. 25396-006.

Respectfully submitted,



Kyle Turley, Reg. No. 57,197
Attorneys for Applicants
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Tel.: (617) 542-6000
Fax: (617) 542-2241
Customer No. 30623

Date: March 9, 2007

ACTIVE 3986247v.1